



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## II.—AN EPIGRAM OF PHILODEMUS AND TWO LATIN CONGENERS.

### I.—ANTH. PAL. XI 34 AND ANTH. LAT. 458.

Some years ago Professor K. F. Smith discussed very entertainingly in this journal <sup>1</sup> the history of the Latin epigram which is named as the source of Ben Jonson's familiar lyric,

Still to be neat, still to be dressed  
As you were going to a feast;  
Still to be powdered, still perfumed, etc.

The Latin verses, of unknown authorship and of uncertain time, but certainly antique, have come down in one of the several ancient collections of fugitive verse which modern scholars have combined into the so-called *Anthologia Latina*, and are printed as number 458 in the edition of Riese.<sup>2</sup> His text is as follows:

Semper munditias, semper Basilissa decores,  
semper dispositas arte decente comas,  
et comptos semper cultus unguentaque semper,  
omnia sollicita compta videre manu,  
non amo. neglectam, mihi se quae comit amica,  
se det: inornata simplicitate valet.  
vincula nec curet capitis discussa soluti,  
nec decoret faciem: mel habet illa suum.  
fingere se semper non est confidere amori.  
quid quod saepe decor, cum prohibetur, adest?

Jonson's song is a very free rendering, it will be seen, of the general antithesis between the "adulteries of art" and native simplicity, which is the theme of the Latin verses. In actual words little has been borrowed, and in the latter part of the first stanza—

Lady it is to be presumed,  
Though art's hid causes are not found,  
All is not sweet, all is not sound—

---

<sup>1</sup> Vol. 29 (1908), pp. 133-155.

<sup>2</sup> Baehrens PLM IV, p. 83.

a thought is introduced which is scarcely hinted at in the Latin lines. However, the English scholars who made this identification were probably right, and had correct feeling in putting together the two poems. For, apart from the similarity of theme and the initial *munditias*, the essential point of resemblance, which deserves to be called imitation, is the anaphora of "still," very gracefully and musically introduced, corresponding to the repetition (which is not exactly anaphora) of *semper* in the Latin lines. It is in fact this repetition which is the most essential characteristic of the style of both poems, and constitutes no small part of such effectiveness as they possess. Toward the end of his paper (p. 154) Professor Smith inquires into the origin and time of the Latin poem, pointing out how difficult it is in compositions of this sort, the style of which had been fixed as early as Martial, to determine a date at any point between the second and the fifth centuries. He concludes with the suggestion that it may have been derived from a Greek epigram of the erotic type such as is represented so abundantly in the fifth book of the Palatine Anthology.

It is not quite with confidence that we can lay hand upon the exact and ultimate original which is thus surmised, but with confidence at least that a similar *motif*, with similar stylistic traits, can be cited from a known author and a known period of antiquity, that the attention is invited of those who may have been interested in Professor Smith's study. I refer to an epigram of Philodemus of Gadara, the Epicurean philosopher, client of L. Calpurnius Piso, whom Cicero characterizes without mention of his name, in the invective against his patron of the year 55 B. C. (in *Pison.* 68 ff.). In these days when the Palatine Anthology is little read, he is doubtless best known to classical students for the philosophical and rhetorical writings which have been recovered from the charred rolls of an Epicurean library at Herculaneum. Of his poems, all of which are short and fall under the comprehensive rubric of epigram, twenty-four, out of a somewhat larger number attributed to him, are recognized by Kaibel<sup>1</sup> as genuine. They are preserved in the Palatine and the Planudean Anthologies, and the

<sup>1</sup> Philodemi Gadarensis Epigrammata, ed. G. Kaibel, Ind. lect. Greifswald 1885.

one which I would here compare with our Latin epigram is A. P. XI 34:

Λευκοίνους πάλι δὴ καὶ ψάλματα καὶ πάλι Χίους  
οἶνους, καὶ πάλι δὴ σμύρναν ἔχειν Συρίην,  
καὶ πάλι κωμάζειν, καὶ ἔχειν πάλι διψάδα πόρνην  
οὐκ ἐθέλω· μισῶ ταῦτα τὰ πρὸς μανίην.  
Ἄλλὰ με ναρκίσσοις ἀναδήσατε, καὶ πλαγιαύλων  
γεύσατε, καὶ κροκίνοις χρίσατε γυνὴ μύροις,  
καὶ Μυτιληναίῳ τὸν πνεύμονα τέγξατε Βάκχῳ,  
καὶ συζεύξατέ μοι φωλάδα παρθениκήν.<sup>1</sup>

That these two poems have not been compared before, which seems to be the case, may be attributed to the relative neglect which has been the fate of all but the most famous writers embraced in the Greek Anthology, and to the almost total neglect of the whole of the Anthologia Latina. Still, while the resemblances of the Greek verses to our Latin poem are I think unmistakable, yet the differences are very considerable, and a relationship would not perhaps be assumed without a closer study of the two compositions. In the first place, while there is a

<sup>1</sup> The editions of Jacobs and of Dübner are of course accessible in any library. Kaibel's more recent publication is indispensable for the study of Philodemus, but as a university "program" of a distinguished scholar it has become very difficult to procure. For those who may not have any of these books at hand a few notes may be added: λευκοίνους (sc. στεφάνους) i. e. wreaths woven of the λευκῶιον (white violet), and apparently expensive or difficult to obtain. Cf. Theophr. ap. Athen. 15, p. 680 ε (στεφανωματικά ἄνθη) πρῶτόν τε τῶν ἀνθῶν ἐκφαίνεσθαι φησιν τὸ λευκῶιον . . . ἔπειτα νάρκισσον. For the comparison which I shall presently make with Horace the following is of interest (ibid. f): τὸ δὲ ῥόδον ὕστερεὶ τούτων καὶ τελευταῖον μὲν φαίνεται, πρῶτον δὲ παύεται (rosa quo locorum sera moretur). Πλαγιαύλων γεύσατε (a bold expression if the text is sound) "tibiarum mihi cantum percipiendum date" (Jacobs), in contrast with the more difficult and elaborate music of stringed instruments (ψάλματα). A difference of opinion about the interpretation of the whole poem hinges upon the meaning of φωλάδα παρθениκήν. Jacobs and the older interpreters explain as, "meretricem e lupanari", i. e. ex lustris, e fornice (φωλεός = hole, cave, lurking-place). But Kaibel rejects this and holds that the poet is tired of revelry with harlots and longs for honorable wedlock. To this he says συζεύξαι points as well as παρθениκή. "φωλὰς ea est quae in cubili iacet". He paraphrases: "facite ut virgo mecum cubile sive thalamum ingrediatur." But I doubt if he is right. The scene portrayed is merely a convivium and not a wedding-feast. Παρθениκή is of course contrasted with πόρνη, but probably not without a certain euphemism. φωλάδα I should explain, as against both Jacobs and Kaibel, to mean "obscure" or "humble", in contrast with the publicity of the fashionable courtesan's life.

common underlying contrast of elaboration and simplicity, yet the application is different in each poem accommodated to the situation which is created in each. In the Greek it is a *convivium*, and the antithesis is between elaborate and costly indulgence which leads to excess (*ταῦτα τὰ πρὸς μανίην*), and festivity of a simpler and saner sort. In the Latin epigram the same antithesis is employed in quite a different setting, as admonition to the self-embellishing Basilissa. It is obvious that there can be no close parallelism of words, or that such as there is appears in a different context. Both poems are expressions of the taste of their respective authors; but the Greek is abstract and without reference to a person or an occasion: the Latin by reason of the personal address receives a special application and motive, and in consequence yields a somewhat different tone. But in spite of these differences there are very significant resemblances, and most of all the very characteristic iteration of *πάλι*, corresponding to the equally characteristic use of *semper*, and producing the effect of a crowded and unlimited list of items suggestive of excess or satiety. As with *semper* in the Latin poem, so this use of *πάλι* is carried through the first three lines, and the whole enumeration is concluded with *οὐκ ἐθέλω*, corresponding to *non amo*. As is so often the case with poetical reminiscences, they appear here especially at the beginning, and as the adaptation proceeds and is fitted to the special argument or occasion the resemblance to the source of the *motif* grows less. Thus one may believe that the author of the Latin epigram, carrying in mind the insistent rhythm and passionate rejection of the first part of this poem of Philodemus, has used its theme and copied its technique, but has adapted its thought to the desired purpose of an admonition or plea to his mistress.

For that it is a plea to the courtesan to be complaisant to her lover without the delays and postponements involved in elaborate toilet and coiffure may be guessed from the two epigrams which follow it in the codex Vossianus, the first of which is likewise addressed to Basilissa:

ante dies multos nisi te, Basilissa, rogavi  
et nisi praemonui, te dare posse negas;

and,

cur differs, mea lux, rogata semper?

It would seem in fact that we have here a group of poems, possibly drawn from a larger cycle, all of which show a certain kinship with epigrams of Philodemus, whether or not we are justified in saying that they were composed under his immediate influence. One poem of the Epicurean philosopher we have already examined. It is creed of revelry, but free from gross eroticism, which mars some of his other verses, nor has the author forgotten his philosophy—*μισῶ ταῦτα τὰ πρὸς μανίην*.<sup>1</sup> With coarser and more drastic phrase a contrast, analogous to that which is drawn between the *δυψάδα πόρνην* and the *φωλάδα παρθενικήν*, was the theme of another composition by this same Philodemus, which is not preserved,<sup>2</sup> but is referred to and briefly summarized by Horace for the purposes of his scabrous argument in Serm. I 2, 120:

parabilem amo venerem facilemque.  
illam 'post paulo' 'sed pluris', 'si exierit vir',  
Gallis, hanc Philodemus ait sibi, quae neque magno  
stet pretio neque cunctetur cum est iussa venire.

---

<sup>1</sup> An interesting comparison may be made with Lucretius, speaking from the same point of view of Epicurean praise of nature in contrast with the costly embellishments of art, II 24:

neque natura ipsa requirit,  
si non aurea sunt iuvenum simulacra per aedes, etc.

<sup>2</sup> A modern composition, apparently based upon Horace's lines, whether as a deliberate forgery or merely as the *jeu d'esprit* of some Dutch scholar, found its way into the excerpts from the Palatine MS. from which Reiske edited portions of the Anthology in 1754. It was reproduced by Brunck in the *Analecta* and even by Jacobs in his first edition, although he knew that it was not contained in the Palatine MS. Toup is said to have been the first one to cite the epigram in illustration of Horace. The whole history of this rather interesting literary curiosity is set forth by Jacobs in Wolf's *Literarische Analekten*, Vol. I (1817), p. 357 ff. The author evidently shrank from the coarseness of Horace's portrayal and sets on one side a figure of matronly severity, on the other a compliant courtesan (*Ἐφύρη*, the girl from Corinth). The concluding couplet is as follows:

*εἰ δὲ μίαν ταύταιν, Πείσον, μ' αἰρεῖν ἐπιτέλλεις,  
εἰν Ἐφύρῃ μίμνω, τὴν δ' ἄρα Γάλλος ἔχει.*

Much more in the spirit of Horace's lines, and doubtless imitated either from him or from the lost epigram of Philodemus, is Martial IX 32 (*hanc volo, quae facilis, etc.*).

To the humorously characterizing names of the courtesan *post paulo, sed pluris*, or of the adulteress *si exierit vir*, in the one class of undesirable amours, correspond the descriptive designations *quae neque cunctetur* and *neque magno stet pretio* in the other. It is to the former class that Basilissa belongs, elaborate, expensive, deferring. The *motif* of delay or postponement of the lover is not touched upon (except by implication) in the first of the Latin poems from which we started (*semper munditias*), nor does it appear in the extant epigram of Philodemus cited above. Their point of community is elaboration versus simplicity. But in the two succeeding epigrams of the Basilissa cycle, delay or postponement is the main theme, as it was in the composition which Horace reports (*quae cunctetur*). The conceit was apparently a favorite one with Philodemus and appears again in a clever piece of realistic dialogue which makes up another of his compositions—a mime of Herondas compressed into the brevity of an epigram, A. P. V 46.<sup>1</sup>

Putting together therefore the fact that the first of the Latin epigrams (*semper munditias*) corresponds in theme and in stylistic treatment (*πάλι—semper*) and even in some verbal echoes (*οὐκ ἐθέλω—non amo*) to the extant epigram of Philodemus—putting this with the circumstance that the second and third of the skits addressed to Basilissa play upon the same *motif* of delay and postponement which was contained in the epigram alluded to by Horace, it will seem most plausible I think to believe that the author of the Latin epigram wrote with conscious adaptation of poems of Philodemus, one of which we still possess.

## II.—ANTH. PAL. XI 34 AND HORACE OD. I 38.

We have not been in the habit of associating Horace's lyric poetry with contemporary influences,<sup>2</sup> and it will doubtless seem

<sup>1</sup> α. Πηνίκα δ' ἤξεις;

β. Ἦν σὺ θέλεις ὤρην. α. Εὐθὺ θέλω. β. Πρόαγε.

<sup>2</sup> Apropos of this remark, my friend Professor Gordon Laing, who very kindly read these notes in manuscript, called my attention to Reitzenstein's valuable address (in N. Jhbb. Vol. 21 (1908), p. 81 ff.) entitled "Horaz und die hellenistische Lyrik". As the title indicates it is the author's purpose to point out how much of Hellenistic (in contrast with Aeolic or Pindaric) motive and technique is present in the Odes.

a far cry from this epigram to *Persicos odi*; and yet I venture to believe that Horace drew the suggestion of his ode from just this source, viz., the lines of Philodemus quoted above—*λευκοίνους πάλι δῆ, κτλ.* Like the Greek the scene is the *convivium*, or its preparations, and the contrast of elaboration and simplicity is the same. The enumerated items of the Greek Horace has compacted into a single generalization,

*Persicos odi puer apparatus,*

*odi* corresponding to the concluding *οὐκ ἐθέλω* of Philodemus, although the word itself was probably suggested by the following *μισῶ ταῦτα*. In the subsequent development of Horace's poem he has selected from the varied items of elaborated revelry just one, the floral ornaments,

*displicent nexae philyra coronae,*

corresponding to the *λευκοίνους (στεφάνους)* with which Philodemus begins. This thought is then expanded with a further detail,

*mitte sectari rosa quo locorum, etc.*

The transition from the negative to the positive is made by Philodemus with *ἀλλά με ναρκίσσοις*, corresponding to

*simplici myrto nihil adlabores,*

and as the first part confines itself to only one of the elements enumerated by Philodemus, so the remainder of Horace's lines are taken up with the praise of the myrtle,

*neque te ministrum*

*dedecet myrtus, etc.*

The evidence of relationship rests upon identity of general theme and situation, with identical antithesis, upon the resemblance of *λευκοίνους* with *nexae philyra coronae*, and of *odi—nihil curo* with *μισῶ—οὐκ ἐθέλω*. The differences are of course

---

More especially, as bearing on the present argument, I would note that he there (p. 95) has put side by side our epigram of Philodemus with *Persicos odi*. More cautiously and perhaps more truly than I have done, he designates the relationship, not as one of dependence or immediate suggestion, but as displaying the same feeling (dasselbe Empfinden). He adds also some interesting illustrations of the conceit of the master giving instructions to his slave. Noteworthy throughout his treatment is the extent to which he uses Philodemus in illustration of Horace.



more remarkable.<sup>1</sup> The art of the one depends upon crowded enumeration (which the repeated *πάλλω* reinforces), of the other upon almost parsimonious selection. The simplicity of Horace is seen in stronger light by this comparison, and may seem almost ostentatious. But as for the artistic result there can be no two opinions. So far from detracting from the reputation and merit of Horace, the disclosure of a source of suggestion serves only to heighten our appreciation of his taste and delicate workmanship. If we had no knowledge of Horace's acquaintance with Philodemus, it would doubtless be most natural to speak of both poets as handling independently a *motif* common to the poetical *nugae*<sup>2</sup> of the time; but in view of the fact that Horace in the second satire expressly alludes to Philodemus and summarizes a related epigram, it seems to me most probable to conclude that he derived the suggestion of his ode from the still extant epigram of Philodemus.

But it is one thing for Horace, in an early satire of cynical morality and dubious taste, to have cited an apposite epigram of Philodemus: quite another thing to assume an influence of the Greek versifier upon the mature lyric poet of a dozen or more years later. It may not therefore be amiss to review briefly some of the evidence concerning the position and influence of Philodemus in the Roman society of his day. He is first introduced to us by Cicero in the anonymous characterization referred to above (in *Pison.* 68). It is obvious that in this passage Philodemus suffers some contamination from the virulence of Cicero's invective against his patron, and yet while the character of the man suffers at Cicero's hands, the description of his poetry is generous, and earns the kind of praise which must have

<sup>1</sup> Although the situation in the two poems is similar, in that both deal with the appointments for the *convivium*, yet there is one difference of technique which might escape observation. Philodemus speaks without personal reference or allusion to any occasion. He creates no scene or situation. Horace, not only here, but elsewhere, with strikingly few exceptions (not more than two or three) does not speak directly from the page of his book to the reader, in the manner of Philodemus and of much modern lyric poetry. He always gives a motivation to his utterance either by addressing a person (as here *puer*, or a friend who is named), a muse or a god, or by personifying an object of address (*o navis, te triste lignum, pia testa*, etc.).

<sup>2</sup> Vid. A. P. X 104 *χαίρει θεὰ δέσποινα . . εὐτέληη*.

been sought for in this style of elegant lubricity ; poema porro facit ita festivum, ita concinnum, ita elegans, nihil ut fieri possit argutius ; in quo reprehendat eum licet, si qui volet, modo leviter, non ut impurum, non ut improbum, non ut audacem, sed ut Graeculum, ut adsentatorem, ut poetam . . . De ipso (Pisone) quoque scripsit, ut omnis hominis libidines, omnia stupra, *omnia cenarum conviviorumque genera*, adulteria denique eius delicatissimis versibus expresserit. There is enough of this sort of thing in the extant epigrams (though not specifically with reference to Piso) to make the characterization wholly credible, but there are on the other hand some very charming pieces which have quite the flavor of Horatian urbanity and philosophy.<sup>1</sup> Indeed it would seem certain that Cicero himself thought better of Philodemus than would appear from his utterances in the invective against Piso, or at any rate formed a more favorable opinion at a later time. For in the de Fin. (II 119), of the year 45, he is named along with Siro, the teacher of Virgil, as *familiares nostros, cum optimos viros, tum homines doctissimos*. His association with Siro in this passage is significant, and it is valuable to learn that he was one of those Epicurean teachers who influenced so strongly that group of younger men who appear in the next generation as the leaders in poetry and letters. That Virgil was the devoted pupil of Siro we know from his own Catalepta (7 and 10) as well as from the ancient lives and the Servian Scholia ; that Quintilius Varus was also a fellow pupil is the interpretation which must be given to the name Varus associated with Virgil's in the same passages ;<sup>2</sup> that L. Varius, the epic and tragic poet, was an Epicurean is attested by Quintilian (6, 3, 78),<sup>3</sup> although we have no record that would associate him with the instruction of Siro. It is clear therefore that the group of Horace's most intimate friends were Epicureans, and two of them at least disciples of Siro. It is, of course, superfluous to remind the reader that Horace himself in his earliest work does not yet profess that eclecticism (*nullius*

<sup>1</sup> See especially the invitation to Piso to join in the Epicurean festival of the "twentieth", A. P. XI 44.

<sup>2</sup> Donatus, vit. Verg. (Reiff. Sueton. p. 68) and Servius ad Ecl. 6, 13.

<sup>3</sup> The editors read *Varo*, the MSS. *Vareo*, which, as Körte says, points to *Vario*. Cf. Körte in the article cited below.

*addictus iurare in verba magistri*) which was his maturer philosophical position. In the satires he is frankly Epicurean (*namque deos didici securum agere ævum*, in the playful confession of faith at the end of the journey to Brundisium).

It has been one of the disappointments of the Herculanean rolls of Philodemus, so strangely preserved and so ingeniously though imperfectly deciphered—treatises which, even in their fragile and broken characters traced upon charred papyrus, have contributed not a little to the later history of philosophical and rhetorical controversy—that they yield a literature so slight and unimportant, and so barren of significance for the time and environment in which they were produced. But here and there are names and personal allusions to comrades or pupils, especially at the beginning and end of treatises. Two such fragments are discussed by A. Körte in *Rh. Mus.* 45 (1890), p. 172 ff. under the title “Augusteer bei Philodem”. The discussion is too technical to be reported in detail, and is easily accessible for those who would follow the matter further. In the first fragment a group of his pupils or listeners are addressed, who having already heard fragmentary parts of the oral discussion of the theme in question (apparently *περὶ κολακείας*) are now asked to give a cordial reception to the completed work. The certain names which appear (in the vocative) are those of Varius and Quintilius, a grouping which can of course mean no other than the comrades of Virgil and Horace; one other name is wholly lost, while the initial V (*i. e.* *Ου-*) of a fourth is still legible. Who would not leap at once to the conjecture of Virgil’s name? But this is not all. Still another fragment, at first sight a mere printer’s pie of letters, reveals in the first line enough to reconstruct *φιλαργυρία* (apparently the theme), and in the fourth and fifth lines a group of names (in the vocative) of which the following letters survive

... *τιεκαιουαρι* . . . . .  
 . . . . *καικουντιλι* . . . . .

Here at all events are Varius and Quintilius again, and Varius may well, as before, have been followed by the mysterious *Ου-* of the former fragment. But whether Virgil was named in the lacuna or not, it is of more interest to speculate upon the trace that is left of the preceding name, *-τιε*. And again, since specu-

lation is free, who could refrain from filling out the lacuna with *Οπα]τιε*? Körte is sober and checks the ardor of his readers with the warning that nothing certain can be gathered from traces so slight (p. 177). And of course he is quite right. However, if any one will take the trouble to put together the Roman gentile names ending in *-tius*—*Trebatius*, *Numatius*, etc., he will soon discover that the field of possible conjecture is greatly narrowed, and that it will not be easy (if indeed possible) to fix upon any name equally probable with that of *Horatius*. But the identification need not be pressed, and we can satisfy ourselves with the certain names, which reveal that the friends of Horace were also the friends and listeners of Philodemus. From the mention of Philodemus in Serm. I 2, 121 it appears that he was a contemporary, and still living, as indeed for other reasons we should have reason to believe. To quote the witticism of a contemporary with approval of its point and acceptance of its doctrine is of course a compliment (however dubious in the present context), and from this perhaps we are justified in concluding that a personal relationship of friendship existed between the two men. It may be noted in contrast that the epigram of Callimachus used just before (v. 109 *hiscine versiculis*) is introduced without name. At all events not only from the epigram quoted does it appear that Horace was well acquainted with the poems of Philodemus, but also from other parts of this same satire it is apparent that he had in mind words and ideas of the same author drawn from other epigrams still extant. That Horace's *o crus, o bracchia*, (v. 92) is an echo of ὦ ποδός, ὦ κνήμης (A. P. V 132), is observed by Jacobs, who also calls attention to the general resemblance of the argument of Horace's second satire with V 126. Details of comparison could be made, but they would not ornament the page nor edify the reader.<sup>1</sup> More wholesome are comparisons of some other epigrams with other parts of Horace, (such as V 112 καὶ παίξω ὅτε καιρός, with *nec lusisse pudet*, etc.), which I shall not now undertake to collect. Many isolated parallels to Horace will be found in Jacobs' notes, (vol. VIII, p. 211 ff.), and on A. P. IX 412 he observes of the

<sup>1</sup> For no reason except its offensiveness Kaibel rejects this epigram as a forgery suggested by Horace. He seems to have forgotten the *libidines* and *stupra* which shocked Cicero (*supra* p. 35).

whole argument: "prorsus Horatiana philosophia, quae saepe conspicitur in poematiis Philodemi". It is the more remarkable therefore (and perhaps a warning also against a hasty conclusion) that he does not place *Persicos odi* in comparison with our epigram XI 34. Nor does Kaibel mention it. But still more remarkable is the fact that no editor of Horace, so far as I have observed, has made the comparison. That the resemblance has been observed however can scarcely be doubted, and the brief notes of the Didot edition of the Anthology conclude with the laconic "cf. Horatii od. I 38."

The comparison with Philodemus, whatever may be thought of its value as furnishing a point of reference for judging the Roman poet's art, can scarcely be thought of as contributing anything to the understanding of the Horatian ode itself. It does however have a certain bearing upon an old problem concerning the constitution of the first book, which has been revived in recent years by several German critics, and especially by Vollmer in his discussion of the Horatian text tradition.<sup>1</sup> Very briefly stated the point is this: that in view of book II with twenty numbers, III with thirty, IV with fifteen, and recalling also Serm. I with ten, and Epp. I with twenty, it has seemed that the thirty-eight numbers of book I called for some justification or explanation of the number indivisible by five, which has been variously attempted. The solution which Vollmer eventually adopts is, that the book originally consisted of numbers 4-38-35,<sup>2</sup> and in this form was passed about privately in the circle of Maecenas; that upon its publication in definitive form 1-3 were added, thus producing the numerical dissonance. As an alternative explanation Vollmer suggests the possibility that *Persicos odi* in its present form is incomplete, and that perhaps the remaining fragment and two other poems (which would make up the desired forty) have fallen out.<sup>3</sup> The utter

<sup>1</sup> Überlieferungsgeschichte des Horaz. Philol. Supplementband X (1905), p. 280, n. 37.

<sup>2</sup> The same suggestion is made by Belling, *Liederbücher des Horatius*, Berlin, 1903, p. 115.

<sup>3</sup> Luc. Müller (*Odes*, I, p. 128), influenced by similar considerations, had also remarked: "Es erscheint daher sehr glaublich, dass hinter I 38 zwei Oden verloren gegangen sind." See the supplementary note at the end of this paper.

improbability of this hypothesis from the standpoint of our text tradition Vollmer concedes. But from the point of view of aesthetic criticism he holds that I 38 forms a very lame conclusion to book I, in comparison with such manifest epilogues as II 20 and III 30. He thinks it by no means clear that I 38 is a completed poem, and contends that the possibility must be entertained that the myrtle and other preparations of festivity await a Myrtale or a Rhode, who has vanished along with a couple of concluding stanzas. Whatever value may be attached to this speculation—and it need not be taken too seriously—it at least may afford occasion for the observation, that *Persicos odi* has the same formal completeness of structure as the Greek epigram which suggested the theme; that is, a negative thesis of that which is not wished (*οὐκ ἐθέλω*) followed by a positive antithesis of that which is desired (*ἀλλά με*). To be sure the erotic touch which Vollmer misses in I 38 is found in the Greek verses, but nevertheless the perfect formal balance of the two compositions entirely excludes the thought of anything more in the Latin lines. It would have pleased Lessing, one may guess, for the purposes of his argument in vindication of Horace—*Rettung des Horaz*—to have observed that the erotic element present in the poem of Philodemus has been entirely eliminated. Not however from any prudery or moral purpose, but because the very structure of the poem (as our comparison has shown) rests upon the treatment of a single item out of the many appurtenances of luxurious festivity which Philodemus names. To have introduced a Pyrrha or a Lyde would have been just as alien to the poet's purpose, as to have brought in the wine, the perfumes, and the music of the scene in Philodemus.

Various meanings have been assigned to this little poem in its position at the end of the first book—either as a quiet contrast to the vehemence of the preceding description of the flight and death of Cleopatra, or as comprehending in the mention of the myrtle of Venus and the vine of Bacchus the conventional themes of lyric verse—but they overlook the natural emphasis which runs through the lines, first negatively—*odi*, *displicent*, *mitte*, and then positively—*simplici myrto*, and of these words the essential one, picked out by its position, is the adjective. The truth is, I suspect, that not without deliberate motive, and with full consciousness of the personal significance which usage

attached to the epilogue, the poet has here employed an opportunity to set forth a personal creed, his love of simplicity. It is true that such a definite note of personal expression cannot be attached either to the final epode nor to the last satire of the second book.<sup>1</sup> But with these exceptions all of the remaining books of Horace present well defined conclusions, and at least four of them are expressions of the poet's own consciousness and personality—the biographical characterization of Epp. I 20, the prophecy and the assurance of immortality in Odes II 20 and III 30, and the polemical defence of his literary position in Serm. I 10. One cannot therefore easily escape the feeling that a final poem by the very fact of its position may have some such meaning, and that to seek it is merely to follow the guidance of the poet's own practice. And what is more natural than that here at the end of the first offering of lyric poems Horace should set down his general profession of faith, his creed of life and of letters. For the former he has to be sure given indications in earlier poems of the first book, and it is not without interest to compare with our thirty-eighth the similar antithesis between luxury and frugality which is contained in the third and fourth stanzas of I 31 (*Quid dedicatum*).

Premant Calenam falce quibus dedit  
fortuna vitem,

\* \* \* \* \*

Me pascunt olivae,  
me cichorea levesque malvae.

But there was more to be conveyed and in a more significant place. Horace has laid before his readers a book of lyric poems which did not follow the stylistic traditions either of Greek models, or of such Roman predecessors as had assayed a similar task. "In translating Greek lyric," as Professor Shorey says (Odes, xviii), "the student must ransack his dictionary for terms rich enough to represent the luxuriance of the Greek compound epithets." Something of this same search, either in the pages of Pacuvius or in the resources of invention, the earlier Roman lyric poets had made, from the bolder efforts of Laevius (*trisaeclesenex*, *dulciorelocus*, *pudoricolorem*, etc.) to the more sober attempts of Catullus in the same direction

<sup>1</sup> And for the benefit of adherents to the pentad or decade theory it should be noted that these two exceptions (disregarding I 38) are found in books with a total which is not a multiple of 5 or 10.

(*sagittiferos, septemgeminus, lasarpiciferis*, etc.).<sup>1</sup> Horace in conscious contrast to such experiments, and true to his principle of restraint and Latin purity had not sought to vie with the gorgeous colors of his Greek models. His medium was, so to speak, black and white. "In considering the means with which he worked, the first thing that strikes us is the simplicity, not to say the poverty of his poetical vocabulary" (Shorey, *ibid.*). A certain amount of poverty there doubtless was, both inherent in the Latin vocabulary, and in the poet's own gifts and temperament, but no small part of it arises from a theory of style which repudiated ornament, and prized restraint and low lights. The expression of this principle, consonant with his personal taste and philosophy of life, we may suspect that he has given here in slight and transparent allegory.

G. L. HENDRICKSON.

NEW HAVEN.

<sup>1</sup> I use the compound epithet (as suggested by Shorey) merely as an illustration, not as embracing the whole theory of style.

[Supplementary note to p. 38 extr. above.]

The protagonist of the doctrine of decades and pentads in the arrangement of the poems of Horace is Belling, in the work referred to above (p. 38). The same scholar (in other publications on Tibullus, Virgil, and Propertius) has pursued his principle through practically all of the Augustan poets, and I fear has succeeded rather in discrediting the kernel of truth from which he starts—it was indicated in all essentials by Kiessling in *Phil. Untersuch.* II, p. 73—than in establishing his own theories. Belling dedicates his book *p̄iis manibus Adolphi Kiessling*, but the spirit of that vigorous scholar can have little joy in the subtleties of his over-zealous disciple. The decade theory is therefore recent, but the doctrine appeared in practical application more than a century before. For in 1778, in the January number of the *Gentleman's Magazine* (Vol. 48, p. 38) there appeared "two additional Odes to the First Book of Horace, lately discovered in the Palatine Library, communicated by Gaspar Pallavacini, Sub-Librarian, with a Commentary." They are numbered I 39 ad Julium Florum, and I 40 ad Librum suum. The discoverer professes to have found them upon a single sheet "*laceratam excerptamque ex aliqua editione Horatiana . . . et forsitan prima*", and he adds "*Chartam ipsam in Archivis tutissime recondidi*". The readers of the *Gentleman's Magazine* seem to have taken the poems in good faith, and in the subsequent issues of the year contribute a number of translations. Other echoes of the discovery in the literature of the time seem very scarce, and indeed it is not probable that English classical scholars ever took the new odes seriously. However they were



reprinted in the same year in the ambitious edition of Jani (Leipz. 1778), and they appear in the old Teubner text of Jahn through the successive editions down to the sixth (revised by Th. Schmid in 1857), where they are placed after I 38, each headed by the words *carmen spurium*. Meyer also included them in his *Anthologia Latina* I, p. 41. English editors seem to have been less hospitable. Anthon in his first edition made them accessible to American scholars, but they are omitted from later issues. Jahn cites a monograph of Iul. Bernh. Ballenstedt, "Über zwei neuerlich entdeckte dem Horaz zugeschriebene Oden," Hannover, 1781, and the British Museum Catalogue contains the entry, "A dissertation concerning two Odes of [or rather ascribed to] Horace [marked as Carm. Lib. I, Ode 39-40] which have been discovered in the Palatine Library at Rome", London, 1789. Mitscherlich assigns to the year 1760 an edition of Prague containing the new odes, which was published without date. If this assignment were correct it might be argued that the forgery is of the Renaissance period (as Lucian Müller, *Odes* I, p. 128, says). But the truth about the Prague edition is probably given more accurately by the British Museum Catalogue, which contains the following title and comment: "Q. Horatii Flacci Opera omnia, ad exemplar Bentlei excusa (nunc insertis duabus odibus novissime repertis aucta, addita quoque de harum odarum inventione epistola G. Pallavacini). 2. tom. Prague, 1775? -80. Privately printed. The second title page, with the leaf containing the letter of Pallavacini, and the two newly discovered odes, inserted between pp. 83 and 84, and here paged 83 i-iv, were printed and added to this edition in 1780." As to the identity of the discoverer a suspicion may be entertained, though I presume it could be resolved either positively or negatively by any one in communication with the records of the Vatican library. It is noteworthy in this connection that Mitscherlich, and the title cited by L. Müller from a sale catalogue, both insert the word "principis" before the name "G. Pallavacini". My reason for suspecting the genuineness of the communication to the Gentleman's Magazine arose in the first instance from the character of the communication itself, and was confirmed by Fea's remark in the preface to his edition (Rome, 1811, I, p. xxxiii) upon the discovery of the odes: "Quisquis ille primus fuerit tanto honore dignus, is certe impostor fuit putidissimus: nullibi enim vel in MSS. Vaticanis, vel in aliis Romanis eas reperire potui". Fea at any rate was in Rome (born in 1753) and in position to ascertain the truth.

The first two lines of the "fortieth" ode (ad librum suum) will perhaps suffice to illustrate the method of fabrication:

Dulci libello nemo sodalium  
forsan meorum charior extitit;

which is of course an adaption of the words and rhythm of *Pompei meorum prime sodalium*, with situation and hints drawn from Epp. I 20 (*carus eris*, etc.). In fact the workmanship throughout is so crassly imitative, that one can scarcely repress the suspicion that the Italian "Sub-Librarian" was merely the mask of some Oxford or Cambridge wag, playing upon the heavy respectability of classical studies as aired in

the Gentleman's Magazine. Of the explanatory notes which accompany the original publication a correspondent of February, 1778 (p. 87), says: "they are paltry in the extreme". But they are better than paltry, they are ludicrous, and seem in fact meant as a parody upon the pedantries of annotation, e. g. "Ex hac Ode (40) luce clarius extat, hunc primum librum primo in publicum prodiisse." But the jester (if my suspicion is right) seems to have carried off his hoax successfully so far as his immediate audience was concerned, and in maintaining a place, even though suspected, in sober editions for nearly a century he doubtless succeeded far beyond his expectation. I have set forth the matter at such length merely as an amusing curiosity. The only serious reason that justifies attention to the subject is the fact that 40 apparently seemed a more reasonable number of odes for the first book, and that the 38th seemed an inadequate epilogue.